

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	0.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/681,803		06/07/2001	Larry Scott Crump	CCP-3358(1)	CCP-3358(1) 5347	
22202	7590	04/30/2004		EXAMINER		
	HIRSCH	BOECK DUDEK S	FISCHER, JUSTIN R			
SUITE 19				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
MILWAU	IILWAUKEE, WI 53202 1733					
				DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/681,803	CRUMP ET AL.					
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Justin R Fischer	1733					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addres	s				
THE REPLY FILED 15 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consections	idered but does NOT p	olace the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		to issues which were r	newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims wo			l an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:	•						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19 and 34</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·					
10. Other:							
			:				

GROUP 1300

Art Unit: 1733

Continuation of 5: As correctly pointed out by applicant, Cordts expressly suggests bi-directional curing can be used via the arrangement of a first and second radiation source below and above the mold, respectively. While applicant contends that the inventive staggered arrangement provides unexpected results, the inventive staggered arrangement was not compared to the closest prior art in which the first and second radiation sources are not staggered (such an arrangement is suggested by Cordts). Regarding Costello and Aiba, the references generally recognize that it is known to stagger radiation sources when more than one radiation source is provided. In this instance, as noted above, Cordts expressly suggests the use of multiple radiation sources below and above a mold. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to stagger the radiation sources in view of Costello and Aiba absent any conclusive showing of unexpected results. It is further noted that the inclusion of a radiation source below and above a mold is seen to necessarily produce some cure gradient across the thickness of the gel coat (first and second surfaces of gel coat would be exposed to radiation source prior to the center of the gel coat). Also, it appears that any sequential bi-directional cure will necessarily establish a cure gradient since the first radiation source (for example from below) will cure the surface adjacent the mold to a larger extent as compared to the center or the surface exposed to the environment.

Justin Fischer

April 27, 2004